

### REMARKS

Claims 18, 19, and 21-23 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 18 and 19 are withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 21-23 are amended to further clarify the invention.

#### I. Preliminary Matter

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for returning the initialed form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 12, 2007.

#### II. Prior Art Rejection

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,433,882 to Mori et al. (hereinafter “Mori”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,349,696 to Hori et al. (hereinafter “Hori”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection in view of the following comments.

Claims 21, 22, and 23, *inter alia* and in some variation recite: “storing separately in a storage device: a plurality of subfiles each generated by dividing print data into packets, a command file which stores a group of commands which control a printer, including a cancel command to stop printing, and a spool file which includes information for specifying the subfile and information for specifying the command file and does not include the subfile and the command file; detecting whether the command file specified by the information for specifying the command file stored in the spool file has been updated or not every time the subfile is read.”

In an exemplary, non-limiting embodiment, the system processes commands during printing. More specifically, in order to promptly process a print canceling command or the like given during processing of the print data, the control command is to be recorded in a print

controlling command file which is different from a subfile which stores print data. The subfiles are generated by dividing the data into packets. Further, the print data itself is not stored in the spool file, information for specifying the subfile (which stored print data) and command files are only stored in the spool file. In other words, *the spool file, the subfiles and the command file are each stored separately*. The print processor monitors the print controlling command file. When the print processor detects *e.g.*, by an increase in file size of the print controlling command file, that the print controlling command file has been updated, the processor reads the print controlling command file. Furthermore, when a print cancellation instruction is added to the print control command file as a result of the reading, transfer of packets to the printer is stopped and a page ending command and a job ending command is transmitted to the printer to end the printing. It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the invention in a general sense, the remarks are not necessarily limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the Examiner better understand the distinguishing aspects of the claims mentioned above.

The Examiner contends that the independent claims 21-23 do not disclose “separately” storing the spool file, the command files, and the subfiles. Accordingly, the Examiner alleges that the spool file 18 of Mori stores the EMF files (alleged subfiles), where each EMF file includes both data files and command files (*see* page 5 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner’s position renders certain claimed features redundant.

In other words, if the claimed subfiles and the claimed command file are considered part of the claimed spool file then the claim should simply recite “storing the spool file” as opposed to reciting “storing a spool file, subfiles and a command file.” That is, the Examiner’s proposed interpretation would render certain claimed features redundant. It is well known that, when

examining the claims of an application, “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” MPEP § 2143.03; see also *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Additionally, “[w]hen evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, **all the limitations of the claims must be considered and given weight**. MPEP § 2143.03; see also *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983) *aff’d mem.* 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, since claimed features are “storing a plurality of subfiles, a command file, and a spool file,” the Examiner should consider and give weight to all of the claimed features.

To expedite the prosecution of the above-identified application and to further clarify the invention, independent claims 21-23 have been amended to further clarify that the claimed spool file, the command file, and the plurality of subfiles are stored separately. Mori fails to disclose or suggest the print data itself not being stored in the EMS file but stored separately in subfiles. Mori does not disclose or suggest not storing the print data in the EMS file and storing only the information for specifying the subfiles (which stores print data) and command files in a spool file. In short, Mori does not disclose or suggest storing separately a plurality of subfiles (each generated by dividing print data into packets), a command file (which stores a group of commands which control a printer), and a spool file which includes information for specifying the subfile and information for specifying the command file and *does not include the subfile and the command file*.

Hori does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of the Mori reference. Hori only discloses a method of canceling printing on page basis. In other words, Hori does not disclose subfiles being configured on packet basis, i.e., making a cancellation on packet basis. Further,

since the update of the cancel command is detected every time the subfile is read, the cancel operation can be performed promptly.

For at least these exemplary reasons, independent claims 21-23 are patentable over Mori in view of Hori. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of independent claims 21-23.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 24, 2007